



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/560,666

12/12/2005

Robert George Hercus

00019

2296

71897

7590

10/17/2007

KAUTH, POMEROY, PECK & BAILEY, LLP

P.O. BOX 19152

IRVINE, CA 92623

EXAMINER

BROWN JR, NATHAN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2121

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/17/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/560,666

Applicant(s)

HERCUS, ROBERT  
GEORGE

Examiner

Nathan H. Brown, Jr.

Art Unit

2121

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nathan H. Brown, Jr.(3) Robert Hercus.(2) David Bailey.(4) Keith Callinan.Date of Interview: 10 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.


Claim(s) discussed: none.Identification of prior art discussed: none.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Robert Hercus presented the capabilities and method of operation of the claimed invention. A discussion of comparable neural network models ensued. The ART and Cascade-Correlation models were mentioned as alternative possible prior art to that used in the first office action. A short consideration of 101 issues raised in the first office action was given. In Re Comiskey was briefly considered as the new 101 hurdle.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required